



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.          | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|---|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/805,781  | 03/22/2004  | Gustavo Abrego       | 50T5608.01/1697              | 9930                   |
| 24272   | 7590        | 03/27/2008           |                              |                        |
| Gregory J. Koerner<br>Redwood Patent Law<br>1291 East Hillsdale Boulevard<br>Suite 205<br>Foster City, CA 94404 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>KOVACEK, DAVID M |                        |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2626             | PAPER NUMBER           |
|   |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>03/27/2008      | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/805,781

Applicant(s)

ABREGO ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID KOVACEK

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to the applicant's amendment, filed 12/10/2007, in which the applicant amends **claims 1, 21**, and **41-47**, submits new **claims 48-51**, and provides arguments regarding patentability over the prior art.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

2. The amendments to **claims 1, 21**, and **41-47**, filed 12/11/2007, have been considered and are accepted. It is noted by the examiner that acceptance to the formal conditions of the claims is not an indication of allowability of those claims over the prior art.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 12/10/2007, with respect to the language added in amended **claim(s) 1, 21**, and **41-47**, previously rejected under 35 USC §103(a), have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the earlier rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, new ground(s) of rejection have been found, and the appropriate rejections are included below in the appropriate sections of this Office Action.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 4-6** and **24-26** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2626

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 8, 15, 28, and 35** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
6. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 14 and 34** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
7. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 7, 12, 27 and 32** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
8. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 9-10, 13, 16, 20, 29-30, 33, 36 and 40** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. **Claim 49** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, **claim 49** contains reference to both a label amplitude parameter and a label duration parameter. It is noted by the examiner that the labels are established as text data according a limitation of parent **claim 1**. No description of either a "label amplitude parameter" or "label duration parameter" was found by the examiner in the specification of the present application. The examiner further contends that it would be unclear to one of ordinary skill in the art how to relate parameters such as "amplitude" or "duration" to text data such as the labels disclosed in the instant application, though both parameters are well known in the art in relation to speech data.

For these reasons, the examiner contends that the limitations of **claim 49** in the instant application are not in compliance with the written description requirement of 35 USC §112, first paragraph.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. **Claims 1-2, 4, 8, 10, 15-17, 21-22, 24, 28, 30, 35-37, 41-47 and 50** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication 2003/0101156, hereinafter referred to as Newman.

Regarding **claim 1**, Newman discloses a system for cataloguing information comprising:

- an electronic device that captures audio/video data corresponding to a photographic target [data acquisition device] (Col. 2, paragraphs 0012-0014; Col. 3, paragraph 0032),
- said audio/video data [Audio, photo and/or video; APV data] including a narration [audio messages] concurrently provided by a narrator specifically to identify where respective subject matter locations are positioned in said audio/video data [selectively retrieved] (Col. 2, paragraphs 0019, 0022-0023, 0025; Col. 3, paragraphs 0032-0033);
- a speech recognition engine that automatically performs a speech recognition process upon said narration to generate labels [tags] that correspond to said respective subject matter locations in said audio/video data (Page 2, paragraph 0017; Page 3, paragraphs 0025, 0033),
- said labels being text conversions of utterances in said narration (Page 3, paragraph 0033 – Page 4, paragraph 0036); and

- a label manager [accessing apparatus] that manages a label mode for generating and storing said labels (Page 3, paragraph 0033; Page 4, paragraphs 0035, 0038; Claim 1),
- said label manager also controlling a label search mode for utilizing said labels to locate said respective subject matter locations in said audio/video data [selectively retrieved] (Page 2, paragraph 0022 – Page 3, paragraph 0023; Page 3, paragraph 0033; Page 4, paragraphs 0038-0039).

Though Newman does not explicitly disclose that tag information is used to help locate data in a storage device, this is implied in disclosing the use of tags to provide identification such as user information and/or date and time of file creation (Page 3, paragraph 0033) because such information is well known in the art for use in selectively finding data in a database, and Newman explicitly teaches the selectively searching for data in the database (Page 3, paragraph 0023).

Regarding **claim 2**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further discloses that said electronic device is implemented as an audio/video camcorder device [video camera] (Page 2, paragraphs 0014, 0021; Page 3, paragraph 0032).

Regarding **claim 4**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further discloses that said label manager initially instructs

Art Unit: 2626

said electronic device to enter a real-time label mode [data acquisition devices read at a fixed time interval] for creating and storing said labels [tags] (Page 3, paragraphs 0032-0033), said electronic device concurrently [run continuously or run selectively at desired times] capturing said audio/video data and said narration after said label manager instructs said electronic device to enter said real-time label mode (Page 3, paragraph 0032).

Regarding **claim 8**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further discloses that said label manager stores said labels during a real-time label mode, said labels being stored along with meta-information that associates each of said respective subject matter locations to a corresponding one of said labels [date and time] (Page 3, paragraph 0033).

Regarding **claim 10**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further discloses that said label manager instructs said electronic device to enter a non-real-time label mode [data access after operation is complete] for creating and storing said labels [data review], said electronic device responsively retrieving and playing back said audio/video data and said narration (Page 4, paragraph 0035-0037).



Regarding **claim 15**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further discloses that said label manager stores said labels in a non-real-time label mode, said labels being stored along with meta-information that associates each of said respective subject matter locations to a corresponding one of said labels [tags] (Page 3, paragraph 0032-0033; Page 4, paragraph 0035-0037).

Regarding **claim 16**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further discloses that said label manager instructs said electronic device to enter said label search mode during which a system user interactively selects a search label for performing a label search procedure to locate a specific one of said respective subject matter locations corresponding to said search label [selectively retrieved] (Page 2, paragraphs 0022-0023; Page 3, paragraph 0032; Page 4, paragraph 0038).

Though Newman does not explicitly disclose that tag information is used to help locate data in a storage device, this is implied in disclosing the use of tags to provide identification such as user information and/or date and time of file creation (Page 3, paragraph 0033) because such information is well known in the art for use in selectively finding data in a database, and Newman explicitly teaches the selectively searching for data in the database (Page 3, paragraph 0023).

Regarding **claim 17**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further implies that said label manager generates a label-search GUI on a display of said electronic device, a system user viewing said labels and corresponding representative images [icons] from said audio/video data for selecting a search label (Page 4, paragraph 0035-0038) in disclosing that the data retrieval system as disclosed by Newman includes a selective display capability for presenting relevant data to a user.

Regarding **claims 21-22, 24, 28, 30, and 35-37**, these claims are very similar to **claims 1-2, 4, 8, 10, and 15-17** respectively as applied above, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claims 41-42 and 44-47**, each of these claims is very similar to **claim 1** as applied to above, and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 43**, this claim contains limitations very similar to those found in a combination of **claims 1, 8, 13, and 15**, which are all addressed by Newman individually, and therefore **claim 43** is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 50**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 17** as applied above, and further disclose that said representative images are

implemented as thumbnail images [icons corresponding to an image related to data] (Page 4, paragraphs 0037, 0039).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 5-6, 9 and 51** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman.

Regarding **claim 5**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further renders obvious that said electronic device enters a real-time label mode in response to a verbal label-mode command from a system user, said verbal label-mode command being recognized and provided to said label manager by said speech recognition engine in disclosing a system for labeling [tags] data (Page 3, paragraph 0033) that is responsive to selective searching (Page 2, paragraph 0022 – Page 3, paragraph 0023), and additionally includes voice recognition components for entering data (Page 3, paragraph 0025) because it would be obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to control speech recognition components using speech commands because it is well known in the art and there is no reason not to expect success.

Regarding **claim 6**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further renders obvious that said speech recognition engine automatically generates said labels as said electronic device captures said audio/video data and said narration (Page 2, paragraph 0017; Page 3, paragraph 0032-0033; Page 4, paragraph 0036) by disclosing user access in real-time operation (Page 4, paragraph 0036), that said real-time operation includes the creation of labels [tags] (Page 3, paragraph 0033), and also that the system is implemented in such a way that it is operable by speech recognition methods (Page 2, paragraph 0022 - Page 3, paragraph 0023; Page 3, paragraph 0025).

Regarding **claim 9**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further renders obvious that said electronic device initially captures said audio/video data and said narration prior to entering said label mode (Page 3, paragraph 0033; Page 4, paragraph 0036) by disclosing label creation [user data access] need not be concurrent with initial capturing of audio/video data [APV files] (Page 4, paragraph 0036), and that the data may be stored for later user access (Page 4, paragraph 0035). Motivation to allow for later labeling [tags] of the data is inherent in allowing users to allow users not present to access and organize audio/video data at a later time (Page 4, paragraph 0035-0036).

Therefore, the examiner contends that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Newman in order to allow users not present for the initial data capture to access and organize data using tag information at a later date.

Regarding **claim 25**, this claim is very similar to **claim 5** and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 26**, this claim is very similar to **claim 6** and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 29**, this claim is very similar to **claim 9** and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 51**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further renders obvious that said electronic device is a single discrete video camcorder that hosts said speech recognition engine, said label manager, said labels, and said audio/video data (Page 1, paragraph 0006; Page 2, paragraphs 0014-0015, 0021; Page 3, paragraph 0032) in disclosing the inclusion of a camcorder as a device for initial data capture [video camera] (Page 2, paragraph 0014; Page 3, paragraph 0033), and that the system can be embodied in a single device (Page 1, paragraph 0006).

12. **Claims 3, 14, 18-20, 23, 34, and 38-40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman in view of Belrose (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0144843), cited in a prior Office Action.

Regarding **claim 3**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above. Newman does not disclose, but Belrose discloses:

- said speech recognition engine is configured in a simplified configuration [specific queries] that efficiently compares said narration with acoustic models to identify phone strings [recognizing a user information request] that represent said narration [speech input] (Page 2, paragraph 0030; Page 3, paragraphs 0047, 0051-0052),
- said speech recognition engine referencing a compact dictionary to look up recognized vocabulary words that correspond to said phone strings [one or more queries] (Page 3, paragraph 0048),
- said speech recognition engine utilizing a limited set of recognition grammar to form said recognized vocabulary words into said labels [label for a feature] that are supported by said speech recognition engine (Page 6, paragraph 0106).

The two references are combinable because each is directed to a system for capturing, storing, and browsing audio and/or video data and organizing said data using labels for ease of access to said data. Belrose further provides motivation to combine the references in disclosing the utility of encapsulating such a system into a mobile device [cellular telephone] operable using voice commands (Page 1, paragraph 0003) to allow free mobility of the system.

Therefore, the examiner contends that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Newman with the teachings of Belrose in order to implement a media browser organized using labels that is further encapsulated into a mobile device operable using voice commands to allow free mobility of the system.

Regarding **claim 14**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above. Newman does not disclose, but Belrose discloses that said label manager coordinates a label validation procedure for validating said labels in response to verbal validation commands from a system user [identification], said verbal validation commands being recognized and provided to said label manager by said speech recognition engine [determine the nature of the information to be recorded] (Page 6, paragraph 0098-0108).

This limitation is directly related to the voice command input limitation disclosed by Belrose as applied above to **claim 3**. Therefore, the motivation to combine the references is the same for **claim 14** as applied above for **claim 3**.

Regarding **claim 18**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above. Newman does not disclose, but Belrose discloses that a system user selects a search label by issuing a verbal search-label command [hotspot label], said verbal search-label command being recognized and provided to said label manager by said speech recognition engine (Page 6, paragraph 0106; Page 7, paragraphs 0110-0113).

This limitation is directly related to the voice command input limitation disclosed by Belrose as applied above to **claim 3**. Therefore, the motivation to combine the references is the same for **claim 18** as applied above for **claim 3**.

Regarding **claim 19**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above. Newman does not disclose, but Belrose discloses that said label manager instructs said electronic device to automatically locate and retrieve a specific one of said respective subject matter locations in response to a system user selecting a search label [hotspot dialogue blocks] (Page 6, paragraphs 0106-0108).

Regarding **claim 20**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above. Newman does not disclose, but Belrose discloses that said electronic device automatically plays back a specific retrieved one of said respective subject matter locations [greeting dialog block specific to



Art Unit: 2626

narrator] from said audio/video data for viewing by said system user (Page 6, paragraphs 0097-0100).

Regarding **claim 23**, this claim is very similar to **claim 3** and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 34**, this claim is very similar to **claim 14** and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claims 38-40**, these claims are very similar to **claims 18-20** respectively and are rejected for the same reasons.

13. **Claims 7, 12-13, 27, and 32-33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman in view of Nicholson (US Patent Publication Application 2002/0067859), cited in the previous Office Action.

Regarding **claim 7**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above. Newman does not disclose, but Nicholson discloses a post processor [digital processor] operating in real-time to perform a validation procedure for the labels based upon confidence measures [threshold confidence level] (Page 2, paragraph 0012).

The two references are combinable because each is directed to a system for retrieving media data using labels for the purpose of allowing better organization of said

data. Nicholson further provides motivation to combine in disclosing the utility of a system that is able to discriminate between identifiable and non-identifiable data for the purpose of maintaining a high level of recognition by the user of decoded data with a minimal additional storage cost (Page 2, paragraph 0014).

Therefore, the examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Newman and Nicholson in order to implement a system for retrieving media data using labels that utilizes discrimination between identifiable and non-identifiable data in order to maintain a high level of user recognition of decoded data with minimal additional storage costs.

Regarding **claim 12**, this claim is very similar to **claim 7** and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 13**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** and additionally discloses a validation graphical user interface [display] allowing users to evaluate, delete, and edit labels [tags] (Page 4, paragraphs 0035-0037).

Newman does not disclose, but Nicholson discloses coordinating a label validation procedure for validating said labels (Page 2, paragraph 0012).

The limitations of **claim 13** are very similar to those of **claim 7**, and therefore the motivation to combine the references is the same for **claim 13** as for **claim 7**.

Regarding **claim 27**, this claim is very similar to **claim 7** and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claims 32-33**, these claims are very similar to **claims 12-13** respectively, and each is rejected for the same reasons respectively.

14. **Claims 11, 31, and 48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman in view of Adams (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0008209), cited in a previous Office Action.

Regarding **claim 11**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above. Newman does not disclose, but Adams discloses automatically [addressing devices automatically] generating labels [meta-data] by analyzing audio/video data and narration data during playback of said audio/video data and said narration data (Page 3, paragraph 0074-0080).

The two references are combinable because each is directed to a system for storage and retrieval of media data. Adams provides motivation in disclosing the utility of providing automated association of meta-data to audio/video data in order to allow for more efficient organization of audio/video data (Page 6, paragraph 0111).

Therefore, the examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Newman and Adams in order to implement a system for storage and retrieval of media

data that utilizes automated association of meta-data to said media data in order to allow for more efficient organization of said media data.

Regarding **claim 31**, this claim is very similar to **claim 11** and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 48**, Newman discloses all limitations of **claim 8** as applied above. Newman does not disclose, but Adams implies the use of video timecode information as a component of said meta-data in disclosing the storage of meta-data that comprises arrangement data with regard to media data such as video data (Page 3, paragraph 0079), because timecode information is a well-known and readily-available method of arranging frames of video data.

The motivation to combine the references as applied to **claim 48** is the same as applied above to **claim 11**, because each claim presents limitations that are applicable to the automatic arrangement and organization of data and meta-data on a storage component of a media data retrieval system.

### ***Conclusion***

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Paolini (US Patent 5,838,917) teaches an interactive video communications system.

- Hoffert (US Patent (5,903,892) teaches a method of indexing media on a network.
- Beigi (US Patent 6,345,252) teaches a method and apparatus for retrieving audio data using content and speaker information.
- Kanevsky (US Patent 6,434,520) teaches a system and method for indexing and querying audio data.
- Chen (US Patent 7,177,795) teaches a method and apparatus for indexing and retrieving media data using audio input.
- Lehmeier (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0184196) teaches a system and method for utilizing voice input with searchable meta-data.
- Chengalvarayan (US Patent Application Publication 2005/0114357) teaches an indexing system for tagging media data.

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Kovacek whose telephone number is (571)270-3135. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Talivaldis Ivars Smits/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626